

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/687,170	10/17/2003	Edward A. Enyedy	LEEE 200336	1901	
27885	27885 7590 06/28/2005			EXAMINER	
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SEVENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44114			LAM, THANH		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,				
			DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Je-				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Occurrence	10/687,170	ENYEDY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thanh Lam	2834				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	— s action is non-final.					
, _						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/687,170 Page 2

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/29/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments

- 1. In response to applicant's argument that "the fields of endeavor of FIGURE 1 and Yamada et al. are entirely distinct and not likely to be cross-referenced by applicants or those skilled in the art practicing in one or the other of the two fields of endeavor". is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, The examiner submits that the fields of endeavor of FIGURE 1 and Yamada et al. are proper because the proposal in combination of both references are in same field of motor structure, specifically in brushes arrangement. Therefore, it is analogous art(s).
- 2. In response to applicant's argument that "Examiner has impermissibly concluded that claim 1 is obvious in view of a combination of FIGURE 1 and Yamada et al. without any legitimate support on the record" there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/687,170

Art Unit: 2834

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the record is clearly shown by combined the two cited references, and regarding motivation is support a phase underlined above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art hereinafter' APA (fig. 1 of the application) in view of Yamada et al. (4,827,897).

Application/Control Number: 10/687,170

Art Unit: 2834

APA discloses all the aspect of the claimed invention except for a third brush circumferentially spaced from said first brush a second annular distance around said commutator and connectable to said second lead to cause said motor to rotate at a second speed to drive said rolls at a second speed, and a switching circuit with an operative condition to connect said second lead to a selected one of said second and third brushes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an additional bush (third brush) to the APA in order accommodate arrangement of Yamada et al. as describes above that would provide the motor easily change the roration of the speed.

Regarding claims 2-22, the proposal in combination of the APA and Yamada et al. disclose all the aspect of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2834

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Lam whose telephone number is (571) 272-2026. The examiner can normally be reached on t-f 9-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren E Schuberg can be reached on (571) 272-2044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thánh Lam
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2834